UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,412	04/21/2004	Timm J. Fenton	A36133 - 072841.0230	5967
21003 BAKER BOTT	7590 11/02/2007		EXAMINER	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			WEAVER, SUE A	
	44TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10112-4498			PAPER NUMBER
,			3781	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	,		11/02/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DLNYDOCKET@BAKERBOTTS.COM

, •	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Intonvious Summans	10/829,412	FENTON ET AL.				
Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sue A. Weaver	3781				
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):						
(1) <u>Sue A. Weaver</u> .	(3) <u>Lisa Chiarini</u> .					
(2) <u>Stephen Kenny</u> .	(4)					
Date of Interview: <u>05 October 2007</u> .						
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]						
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e)⊠ No.	`				
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1,15 and 26</u> .						
Identification of prior art discussed: Tsai '823 and Lu '459, both of record.						
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.						
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)						
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.						

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

. . .

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' attorneys requested the interview to derive a better understanding of how the references met the limitations of the independent claims and particularly how the examiner considered the first member to be selectively in communication with the internal volume of the tubular member. The examiner pointed out that there didn't appear to be sufficient structure set forth in the claims to effect this selective communication and therefore it was considered to be no more than a statement of desired result. The examiner suggested the addition of a limitation such as actuation means for actuating the first member to provide such structure. With regard to Tsai the examiner pointed out member 84 as being the joint lock member with members 96 and 110 together defining the first member with the tip of 96 external to member 84 while member 100 was considered to be in selective communication with the interior volume of member 16. With regard to Lu member 12 was indicated as the joint locking member with member 32 as the first member with 321 as shown in figure 2 as the protrusion in communication with the tubular member selectively by removing member 322. Several possibilities were discussed for defining over the references such as making the protrusion in selective communication with the tubular member instead. However that would not appear to distinguish over Lu which is still selective when disassembled or Tsai with regard to member 16 and member 100. The spring in member 20 of Tsai would still remove member 100 from communication with member 16...